

Chances for Milk Sanitation Legislation Have Become Brighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Speaker, the Dairy Record, one of Nation's leading publications in dairy field, has commented editorially on the ever-increasing support for national milk sanitation legislation. Under leave to extend by remarks, would like to include this editorial in the May 4, 1960, issue of this magazine in the Record:

BEHIND THE NEWS

While the possibility of passage of the national Milk Sanitation bill did not change materially as a result of the House hearing last week, its chances are brighter than they have ever been. The nominal convention of the two parties will call an early adjournment of Congress which makes it appear doubtful at this time if the bill can be passed at this session. However, there is the remote possibility that this could be brought up for action on the floor of both Houses before adjournment.

Last fall it appeared almost hopeless that the measure would receive much attention this short session, but it is evident that proponents of the bill introduced by Representative LESTER JOHNSON, of Wisconsin, have been extremely busy in gaining support for the legislation.

A major victory was won by backers of the bill when Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in a letter to Representative CHARLES HARRIS, chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported favor on the bill and Assistant Surgeon General David E. Price of the HEW, at a congressional subcommittee meeting of the House endorsed the measure.

Secretary Flemming stated that the objections of the Department to previous sanitation bills had been eliminated in the John measure and he pointed out that HEW consistently held that health regulation should not be used as domestic trade barrier to the interstate shipment of milk and products of high sanitary quality.

He stated further that despite the improvement that has been made in sanitary quality of milk accruing from Federal and local milk sanitation programs, still remain many areas where the sanitary quality of milk and milk sanitation practices do not meet presently accepted standards. For this reason, he declared that the would result in added health protection, a substantial segment of the Nation's sanitation.

Appearing at last week's hearing, in favor of the bill, were representative consumers groups, State health boards, cultural groups, Congressmen, Governor and State agriculture departments from Midwest, the East and the Southwest.

All presented strong arguments why the bill should be passed and one of the strongest offered was that in agricultural measure is for the protection of the consumer. It was pointed out that in areas where there is a period of shortage milk is purchased from outside sources it is in many cases of dubious quality.

Appearing in opposition to the John bill were for the most part representative producer groups, principally from the

Birmingham, a place we had never been or even had any idea of what it was like.

We arrived on Sunday, April 10, at 12:30, at the edge of Birmingham, asking our way around. Everyone went out of their way to help us find the hospital. We arrived there at 1 p.m. to see our daughter. We had not been there long when we could see she had the care and love of the best doctors and nurses available.

We were strangers in this big city but yet we felt like this was a sort of home. We knew our daughter would be well again. Later, we rented an apartment and our landlady was just like a mother to us. The minister called on our daughter, and we attended the church of our faith on Easter Sunday. It was wonderful to be in church a thousand miles from home and feel the warmth and comfort that we so needed at that time.

When our daughter was out of danger, we went shopping, only to be treated royally again by the good people of Birmingham. We will never forget the fine meals we were so graciously served in the various eating establishments. The service stations and garages, too, afforded us the same courteous service.

Then the good word came that we could start home, taking our daughter with us. This meant a great deal to us knowing that in 5 or 6 weeks she will be able to walk again. As we stood on the 10th floor of the hospital the night before we left, we were somewhat saddened looking out at the beautiful lights of the city. It is a second home to us and there will always be a warm place in our hearts for the good people who made our life so wonderful while in that big and beautiful city.

Can this be Birmingham? It sure can.

EDWARD J. JACOBSON.

WATERLOO, IOWA.

Being Intelligent About Intelligence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 2, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, a good many words have been spoken in recent days about this Nation's intelligence operations and their efficiency and effectiveness. When policy decisions may be made on the basis of secret intelligence material, there is a conflict which can be settled only by full and frank discussion of these policy matters by the responsible political authorities without disclosure of agencies, sources, or methods. When political authorities allow the impression to gain currency that they are not in full command of their decisions, or that their information may have been faulty, they encourage speculation and comment which is not in the national interest.

In that connection, I would like to submit for the Record an editorial which appeared in the Hartford Courant and which contains an authoritative understanding of the intelligence cycle. The editorial states that one reason why intelligence activities of this Nation often appear to be both inept and amateurish is that there has seldom been an adequate appreciation of the importance of

intelligence on the part of responsible persons in the Government.

It seems to me that the recent events, which coupled with incidents that have occurred over more than a decade now indicate a need for a continuing review and supervision of the national intelligence machinery. The article which is reprinted in the editorial, and which I have not included at this point, believes that CIA is far too large and the responsibilities assigned its Director are too great to permit effective control. These are technical matters which deserve congressional study and decision. The entire field, it is apparent, deserves continuing congressional supervision by a committee which might well be organized along the lines of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

THE EDITORIAL FOLLOWS:

BEING INTELLIGENT ABOUT INTELLIGENCE

Elsewhere on this page today appear some penetrating comments on the organization of the Central Intelligence Agency, and perhaps more important, on our whole approach to the subject of military intelligence. The article, which appeared in the London Daily Telegraph, was written by General MacLachlan, himself a British intelligence officer during World War II.

Although Mr. MacLachlan's article is reasonably comprehensive, it fails to mention the principal reason why our intelligence activities are often both inept and amateurish. That reason is that there is not now nor has there ever been an adequate appreciation of the importance of intelligence on the part of responsible persons in the Government, whether in the armed forces or in high elective positions. During the entire period between World War I and World War II, aside from such routine tasks as were performed by the attachés, military intelligence received little attention from anyone. And the intelligence commanders of the various corps areas, commands, the G-2 assistant chiefs of staff, were principally public relations officers and nothing more. Even today, in the Department of the Army, all of the top General Staff officers but one have the title of Deputy Chief of Staff and the rank of lieutenant general. The one officer who does not have this rank is the director of intelligence, who is only an Assistant Chief of Staff, with the grade of major general.

Perhaps Washington's failure really to understand and appreciate the importance of military intelligence is a reflection of the attitude of the American people who, generally, look upon intelligence as espionage of any kind. But in this world in which we live our national existence demands that we make every effort to learn all we can of what our potential enemies are up to. Whether we like it or not, we must have well-trained and efficient intelligence agencies, and the sooner we realize that fact the better it will be for all of us.

It might be pertinent here also to suggest that all intelligence activities must of necessity be conducted with the utmost secrecy, and that all governmental agencies concerned give consideration to what they are saying or not to say should anything resembling the U-2 incident arise again. Here, so we can take a lesson from the British. After the U-2 incident had been discussed by Prime Minister Macmillan and Selwyn Lloyd, the Foreign Secretary, the British Foreign Office spokesman was asked for comment. He said: "It would appear to be an intelligence operation and it is not the habit of the British Government to comment on operations of that nature either of its own or of its friends."

That should be our policy, too.